

Respect gay marriage

Business



Same sex marriages have been on the rise in the last four decades or so. Pro-same sex marriage lobbies have articulated that these need to be treated on par with conventional marriages. They believe that since most of the parameters that apply to heterosexual marriages, such as love, caring, commitment, fidelity, promiscuity and so on apply to these marriages as well. They see it as the exercise of natural choice, and refute the procreation aspect by claiming that they can have offspring, too. Testimony to this claim is the fact that no less than a quarter of the estimated 600, 000 same sex couples in the US have adopted children. (D’Cruz, 387-8) They claim, with credibility, and backed up by facts, that when it comes to habitation, they go by the same set of conditions -they have the same commitment to their children as heterosexual people, live a life in which they cooperate with each other in all major aspects of life, pay taxes and contribute to society.

Thus, according to this segment, there should not be nay moral exclusion by these people should be viewed as the main stream of the society. However, they ignore the moral and religious grounds. In a country where currency notes contain the words, “ In God We believe”, it is a blasphemy to encourage this segment of thought process and legalize it. (D’Cruz, 384) The total percentage of gay and lesbian population is about 10% (D’Cruz, 380) of the population and their ways of life significantly ramify the normal ways, livelihood, religion and beliefs of the rest 90%. (D’Cruz, 380) Thus, it is recommended that the authorities should restrain from legalizing these minority population in favor of the majority as it is expected of a democratic society.

Measures should be taken to make the authorities understand the good of the greater mass. It should be noted that marriage should be defined in constitution to be between a man and a woman but gay couples or those who chose this life style should be awarded the same benefits as heterosexual couples and it should not be called marriage but may be civil union since that is what these same sex couples want. This is the only possible way to help solve this same sex marriage issue without hurting the social and religious sentiments. In the simplest terms, same sex marriage, as the term indicates, is the marriage between individuals of the same sex. There is disagreement over whether this term is analogous to gay marriage, since some people can be homosexual, and could still be in a heterosexual marriage. Those who oppose the usage of the term ' gay marriage' do so because they would like the genealogy to include what are called ' LGBT', or lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender relationships.

(D'Cruz, 385)By whatever names they were called, unions between people of the same sex have existed since ancient times in almost all parts of the world; some prominent examples are those of Greece, in which an elderly man would cohabit with a younger male, in a manner strikingly similar to heterosexual practice. This often happened with the full consent of the family and the society. Acquiescing with an elderly man of considerable social standing was perhaps a way to climb the social or intellectual ladder. In ancient Rome, too, this practice is believed to have existed for centuries before the advent of Christianity. Once this religion was born, with its firm accent on marriage as a means for procreation, same sex relationships

started to go underground, perhaps in view of the enormous influence the Church held over people's daily lives.

In the US, as late as the 19th century, two women would cohabit and make commitments to each other, in what was known as Boston Marriage in a system. (D'Cruz, 382) There is the argument that same sex marriages can never exist, since marriage is one that is a union between a male and female; hence, in this sense, the idea of same sex marriages is a kind of oxymoron, since same sex couples can never meet the most essential purpose of a marriage in the Judeo-Christian sense, procreation. Courts have traditionally held the view that marriage is untenable if it does not lead to procreation; seen in this sense, supporters of same sex marriages argue that even old people and sterile heterosexuals should be denied marriage. This argument, though, is defeated by the allusion to the point that with the advancement of science, it is possible for same sex couples also to have children. The argument that children of same sex parents suffer ostracism and become objects of ridicule in society is countered by the fact that once these couples of civil unions separate, due legal protection is offered to the children. This protection is far superior to and more solid than what is offered to children of heterosexual parents, who are not obliged to provide financial support for their children.

Same sex marriage is contrary to nature's creation; they term homosexuality the height of deviant behavior comparable to some of the most heinous acts, and equate its very existence to promiscuity and sexual depravity. Another extremely important factor these opponents of same sex marriages put forward is that one of the prime functions of marriage is biological; when

<https://assignbuster.com/respect-gay-marriage/>

same sex marriages render this impossible, how can this be considered as any kind of marriage? Another argument put forward in opposition to same sex marriages is legalizing it runs contradictory to established law -while on the one hand, the government bans some sexual practices such as sodomy, legalization of same sex marriages would negate that, as this practice is accepted as common practice in same sex marriages, especially between two men. (D’Cruz, 388)The bottom line in the argument against same-sex marriage lies in tradition, which, by its very nature, carved into the psyche of society. While commitment and obedience to the rules set by ancestors may be commendable and inspirational, it cannot hold its ground on a human or legal standpoint; debates regarding the trivial notions of following certain traditions are worlds apart from weighing the concepts of tradition versus equality, of values versus need. Society must realize that tradition, including all the accompanying rituals, beliefs, and values, were created by people as well-which makes it subject to error and bad judgment, or at the very least at a low level of relevance for current times. There should be complete citizen’s rights to these people and should be legally allowed to live as couples.

Nevertheless, this would be strictly immoral. The sentiments of the mass should be taken into consideration and should be valued by the authorities. Thus, the only way possible is to strictly define the definition of marriage as per constitution. The institution of marriage should be well defined as a union between a man and a woman and not between members of the same sex. As for the gay couples, the institution should be referred to as civil union and not ‘ marriage’ under any circumstances.

The same sex couples want a legal recognition and this term, 'civil union' should well suffice. On the other hand, the sacred institution of marriage would be unaffected and the sentiments of the religious and social norms would be protected.